



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,117	01/11/2002	Peter A. Yared	16159.020001; P6415	1021
32615	7590	02/18/2005	EXAMINER	
OSHA & MAY L.L.P./SUN			LIEN, TAN	
1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800			ART UNIT	
HOUSTON, TX 77010			PAPER NUMBER	

2141

DATE MAILED: 02/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/046,117

Applicant(s)

YARED ET AL.

Examiner

Tan Lien

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract is reflecting claim 1 which is so broad that it describes so many other inventions including prior arts used to reject the claims. It should be stated in plain ordinary English so that one of ordinary skill in the art can capture the essence of the invention.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 12-13, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mlynarczyk et al (US PGPub 2002/0029375).

Art. Unit: 2141

Claim 1: Mlynarczyk teaches a method for dynamically casting an object graph, comprising:

creating an internal representation using a root object of the object graph (paragraph [0033], [0039] & [0043] and Fig. 4; wherein the local system is creating or replicating the same inheritance hierarchy as in the server S. Smart PA and Smart PB are internally representing interface A and interface B on the server where the interfaces are inheriting base class or root class represented by the RMI block);

instantiating a cast object graph using a casting rule and the internal representation (paragraph [0040]; wherein the casting rule is the encapsulation of the references to the remote objects in the naming system where the references maps to the local SmartProxy A and SmartProxy B clases); and

populating the cast object graph (paragraph [0048]; wherein when the cast object graph is instantiated the constructor of the collection of objects initialized the object attributes by populating them with default values).

Claim 2: Mlynarczyk teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:

instantiating a cast object graph attribute using the casting rule and the internal representation (paragraph [0040]; when the object graph is cast to a different

name, the attributes are implicitly cast).

Claim 4: Mlynarczyk teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:

obtaining a class definition, wherein the class definition is used to create the internal representation (paragraph [0033]; wherein when the creation of objects are initiated the system has to reference the class definition to create and instantiate the object which has internal representation).

Claim 5: Mlynarczyk teaches the method of claim 4, wherein

the class definition is generated at runtime by a transport packager (paragraph [0039]; wherein when the system is replicating the same inheritance hierarchy at runtime in RMI, the class definition has to be used in order for the system to define the features of the objects).

Claim 6: Mlynarczyk teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the casting rule comprises

a casting method (paragraph [0040]; wherein the casting rule is the encapsulation of the references to the remote objects in the naming system where the references maps to the local SmartProxy A and SmartProxy B clases).

Claim 7: Mlynarczyk teaches the method of claim 6, wherein

the casting method implements a mapping method (paragraph [0040]; wherein the casting rule is the encapsulation of the references to the remote objects in the naming system where the references maps to the local SmartProxy A and SmartProxy B clases).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 10-11, 14, 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mlynarczyk in view of Cohen et al (US Patent 6,125,400).

Claim 3: Mlynarczyk teaches the method of claim 1, but fails to explicitly teach

retrieving the root object using a variable usage specification.

Cohen, in an analogous art, teaches a variable usage specification used to transport necessary object attributes (col. 2 lines 32-50). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mlynarczyk's method of dynamically casting object graph with Cohen's method of selectively

serializing the objects, for the advantage of reducing the amount of information sent to invoke a remote application (col. 2 lines 5-10 Cohen).

Claim 10: Mlynarczyk teaches the method of claim 1, fails to explicitly teach

the internal representation is a serialized file.

Cohen, in an analogous art, teaches serializing an object with internal representation before transporting to the remote site. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mlynarczyk's method of dynamically casting object graph with Cohen's method of serializing an object, for the advantage of reducing the amount of information sent to invoke a remote application (col. 2 lines 5-10 Cohen).

Claim 11, 22, 23: Mlynarczyk teaches a method for dynamically casting an object graph, comprising:

obtaining a class definition, wherein the class definition is used to create an internal representation (paragraph [0033]; wherein when the creation of objects are initiated the system has to reference the class definition to create and instantiate the object which has internal representation);

creating the internal representation using the root object of the object graph (paragraph [0033], [0039] & [0043] and Fig. 4; wherein the local system is creating or replicating the same inheritance hierarchy as in the server S. Smart

PA and Smart PB are internally representing interface A and interface B on the server where the interfaces are inheriting base class or root class represented by the RMI block);

instantiating a cast object graph using a casting rule and the internal representation (paragraph [0040]; wherein the casting rule is the encapsulation of the references to the remote objects in the naming system where the references maps to the local SmartProxy A and SmartProxy B classes);

populating the cast object graph (paragraph [0048]; wherein when the cast object graph is instantiated the constructor of the collection of objects initialized the object attributes by populating them with default values); and

instantiating a cast object graph attribute using the casting rule and the internal representation (paragraph [0040]; when the object graph is cast to a different name, the attributes are implicitly cast).

retrieving a root object of the object graph using a variable usage specification;

Mlynarczyk, however, fails to explicitly teach retrieving the root object using a variable usage specification.

Art Unit: 2141

Cohen, in an analogous art, teaches a variable usage specification used to transport necessary object attributes (col. 2 lines 32-50). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mlynarczyk's method of dynamically casting object graph with Cohen's method of selectively serializing the objects, for the advantage of reducing the amount of information sent to invoke a remote application (col. 2 lines 5-10 Cohen).

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mlynarczyk in view of Ecklund (US Patent 4,853,843).

Claim 8: Mlynarczyk teaches the method of claim 6, but fails to explicitly teach the casting method implements a suffix method.

Ecklund, however, teaches a method of adding a suffix to make an object name unique (col. 19 lines 4-10 and col. 40 lines 1-2). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mlynarczyk's method with Ecklund's method of adding a suffix to make an object name unique, for the advantage of resolving name conflicts among objects (col. 40 lines 1-5 Ecklund).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mlynarczyk in view of Soloff et al (US PG PUB 2002/0188950).

Claim 9: Mlynarczyk teaches the method of claim 6, wherein the casting method implements an interface, but fail to teach implementing a parser method.

Soloff, however, teaches a parser application to search and replace text strings on selected files or directories (paragraph [0077]). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mlynarczyk's method with Soloff's method of a parsing function to search and replace text strings, for the advantage of providing flexibilities in searching and replacing functions.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Tan Lien whose telephone number is (571) 272-3883. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30am to 6pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3718.


Art Unit: 2141

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [tan.lien@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Tan Lien
Examiner
Art Unit 2141


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER